

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/334,986	06/17/1999	ANDREW MARK WARD	CPW-50361/US 5950	
7590 04/20/2004			EXAMINER	
Pillsbury Winthrop LLP			LANGEL, WAYNE A	
Intellectual Property Group PO Box 10500 Mclean, VA 22102			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1754	

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

FILING DATE SERIAL NUMBER FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

> EXAMINER PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT

DATE MAILED:

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application. COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☐ This application has been examined Responsive to communi	cation filed on 10-2	803 X This action is made final.
A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire	month(s), to become abandoned. 3	days from the date of this letter. 5 U.S.C. 133
Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION	DN:	
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.</li> <li>Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.</li> <li>Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.</li> </ol>	_	Oraftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948. Informal Patent Application, PTO-152.
Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION		į
1. Claims 20-27		are pending in the application.
Of the above, claims		are withdrawn from consideration.
2. Claims		have been cancelled.
3. Claims		are allowed.
4. Claims 28 - 27		are rejected.
5. Ciaims		are objected to.
6. Claims	are subi	ect to restriction or election requirement.
7. This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.	R. 1.85 which are accept	table for examination purposes.
Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.	·	, ,
9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on areacceptable; not acceptable (see explanation or Notice or		Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings ing Review, PTO-948).
10.  The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed or examiner;  disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).	n has	(have) been approved by the
11. The proposed drawing correction, filed, h	as been □approved; [	disapproved (see explanation).
12. Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C		
<ol> <li>Since this application apppears to be in condition for allowance excaccordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11</li> </ol>		secution as to the merits is closed in
14 Cther		·

Serial No. 09/334,986

Art Unit 1754

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 20-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Quinlan et al., for the reasons given in the last Office action. Applicant's argument, that the only ternary perovscite oxide catalysts tested were strontium-doped lanthanum cobaltate and strontium-doped lanthanum manganate, and that this disclosure would not have rendered obvious an A-site dopant cation comprising cerium or praseodymium, is not convincing, since Quinlan et al. make it clear at column 5, lines 50-58 that the A cation may be a mixture of lanthanide cations, which would embrace a mixture of cerium and non-variable valency rare earth Applicant's argument, that doping the mixed oxide elements. phase with cerium or praseodymium results in different effects than would be observed with alkaline earth doping, is not convincing, since there is no evidence on record to support such contention. Applicant's argument, that applicant has found that

Serial No. 09/334,986
Art Unit 1754

addition of even small amounts of cerium into the A-site of lanthanum cobaltate produce an ammonia oxidation catalyst with higher selectivity to nitrogen monoxide than the un-doped catalyst, and that this is illustrated in Example 1 of the present application, is not convincing. This comparison is not made with the closest prior art since Quinlan et al. specifically disclose at column 6, lines 4-9 that where A is lanthanum only, B is not cobalt. Applicant's argument, that the results shown in the Table on page 7 of applicant's remarks filed on October 28, 2003 demonstrate that the cerium-doped catalysts give higher efficiency results than the strontium-or un-doped lanthanum cobaltate, is not convincing, since these results are not presented in declaratory form. In any event, there is no evidence on record of unexpected results when employing praseodymium in combination with cobalt and at least one non-variable valency element selected from the group consisting of yttrium and a non-variable valency rare earth element for the oxidation of ammonia in accordance with the process recited in applicant's claim 20. Accordingly any showing of unexpected results is not commensurate with the subject matter recited in applicant's claims.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

Serial No. 09/334,986

Art Unit 1754

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wayne A. Langel whose telephone number is (571) 272-1353. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8 A.M. to 3:30 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley Silverman, can be reached on (571) 272-1358. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR)

Art Unit 1754

system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either private PAIR or public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

WAL:cdc

March 29, 2004

MAYNE A. LANGEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER